

REMARKS

Each of claims 1-4 and 6-15 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Each of claims 1-4 and 6-15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Shaver et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,947,736, hereinafter "Shaver") in view of one or more of Lesguillier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,727,804, hereinafter "Lesguillier"), DeRuijter et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050036568 A1, hereinafter "DeRuijter"), Johnston et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,360, hereinafter "Johnston"), Folger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,337,044, hereinafter "Folger"), Watler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,836,655 B1, hereinafter "Watler"), Griffin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040063456, hereinafter "Griffin"), and Kang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050101312, hereinafter "Kang"). In particular, claim 1 stands rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Shaver in view of Lesguillier and Folger. **Claim 1** is directed to a central base for a private wireless local area network and recites, in part, an electronic central unit that is supplied with electricity by at least one live supply line intended to be connected to an external electricity power source, said electronic central unit adapted to communicate with a public telecommunication network via a plain old telephone service (POTS) connection, and with at least one wireless peripheral device, according to a digital bidirectional wireless protocol for a private wireless local area network; an interface circuit which is controlled by the electronic central unit of said central base and which is connected to said supply line, the interface circuit adapted to send and receive messages on said supply line, and further adapted to send and receive high frequency periodic signals representative of sent and received messages, wherein the electronic central unit is adapted to communicate messages between either one of the public telecommunication network or the at least one wireless peripheral device and the power supply line; and **a low-pass filter adapted to filter said high frequency periodic signals received from the supply line between the interface circuit of the central base and at least a portion of the electronic circuits of the central base.**

Applicants submit that the Examiner misapplies Lesguillier in alleging that claim 1 obvious over Shaver in view of Lesguillier and Folger. In particular, the Examiner misinterprets the function of the “low-pass band filter (3)” referred to in Lesguillier (see office action at page 7). As Figure 1a of Lesguillier clearly depicts, the filter 3 (“Tx Filter”) receives as an input the signal 2 (“PL_TX”), and outputs a filtered signal to a voltage amplifier 4 (“A_v”). The signal 2 is the transmitted communication signal. Lesguillier explains that the filter 3 removes high frequencies from the transmitted communication signal 2. The portion of text cited and relied upon by the Examiner stands for precisely this proposition. Lesguillier at col. 3, lines 20-31, states:

When the transmitter (1) is active, a communication signal (2) generated by the communication control device enters the transmitter (1) through its signal input. ***The communication signal (2) is referred to as the “PL_TX” input signal (2) hereafter.*** The ***communication signal (2)*** is preferably first sent through a low-pass band filter (3) to ***eliminate high frequencies***. This filtered signal is then fed to the voltage amplifier (4). From the voltage amplifier (4), the current amplifier (6) acts as a follower amplifier and follows the output off the voltage amplifier (4). The communications coupler (7) connects the output of the transmitter (1) to the power line (8).

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would undoubtedly understand that the “low-pass band filter (3)” described in Lesguillier ***removes unwanted high frequency noise*** from the communication signal before the communication signal is amplified and transmitted.

By contrast, the low-pass filter recited by claim 1 is adapted to “filter said high frequency periodic signals (*i.e.*, the high frequency periodic signals representative of sent and received messages) ***received from the supply line between the interface circuit of the central base and at least a portion of the electronic circuits*** of the central base” (parenthetical added). That is, the low pass filter recited by claim 1 ***removes the communication signal*** from the power signal reaching at least some of the electronic circuits of the central base. Thus, the low-pass band filter (3) disclosed in Lesguillier ***passes*** the precise signal that the low-pass filter recited by claim 1 ***removes***. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would ***not*** have been motivated to combine Lesguillier with Shaver (or Folger).

Moreover, neither of the receiver filters (Rx Filter) 10 or 13 disclosed in the receiver of Lesguillier can be construed as the low-pass filter recited by claim 1. Receiver filter 10 acts on the received communication signal “to **remove low frequency noise** as it enters the receiver” (Lesguillier at col. 5, lines 28-32). Receiver filter 13 “isolate[s] only the first harmonic of the received signal and eliminate[s] any distortion” (Lesguillier at col. 3, lines 50-52). Quite simply stated, both of the receiver filters 10 and 13 disclosed in Lesguillier act to remove components **from the received communication signal**, not to filter (*i.e.*, not to remove) the high frequency periodic signals (*i.e.*, the communication signal) recited by claim 1. Thus, it is clear that none of the low-pass band filter 3 and the receiver filters 10 and 13, disclosed by Lesguillier, is the low pass filter recited by claim 1 and, therefore, no combination of any of the filters 3, 10, and 13 with the devices disclosed in Shaver and/or Folger would result in the claimed central base. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants submit that each of claims 2-4 and 6-15 is patentable in view of the remarks presented above with respect to claim 1, because each of claims 2-4 and 6-15 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. Applicants submit this Response with a petition for a one-month extension of time, a Request for Continued Examination, and the required fees, extending the period for response to July 17, 2009. Although Applicants believe that no additional fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 31103/41036. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

July 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Jeremy D. Protas
Registration No.: 61,681
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorneys for Applicants